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Abstract

This paper aimed to investigate employee retention rates in the hotel sector by evaluating the impact of green human resource practices (GHRM). This study utilised a combined method of Structural Equation Modelling (SEM) and Relative Importance Index (RII) to measure the efficiency of GHRM practices. A structured questionnaire involving 460 questions was shared to participants. The data was collected from low-level hotel employees with at least a year of working experience in a green practising hotel in Nigeria. The RII was calculated using the SPSS version 25, and the results revealed that GRS provides a higher RII to retaining employees than other practices. This research proposed GRS as the most effective GHRM policy to improve employee retention rates in the hotel sector. Also, SEM results reveal a significant positive influence of all independent variables on employee retention except GPR which is statistically positive but not significant. Also, SEM-RII method was combined to develop a more novel and robust analytical framework in the field of GHRM practices. GRS was found to be more effective for retention through the use of RII—an effort that has not been reported by any scholar which contribute to the current knowledge base for HRM and practice.
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Introduction

In 2015, the United Nations (UN) adopted a global initiative known as the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). The SDGs are presently practised in Nigeria's 36 states and capital, Abuja. As a set of 17 global goals, the SDGs are intended to serve as a "blueprint for a better and more sustainable future for all" (Alamu, 2017). Each of the 17 goals is aimed at being met by 2030 in every nation of the world (Alamu, 2017). In 2017, Nigeria was one of 44 UN member nations to present their Voluntary National Review (VNR) on SDG implementation at the High-Level Political Forum on Sustainable Development (Armaya’u,
Ogbodo & Ogbodo, 2021). According to the SDG index, Nigeria ranked 160 globally in 2020 for its progress towards meeting SDGs. At present, it is believed that the Nigerian government has efforts in place to direct all development priorities and objectives towards achieving the SDGs (Armaya’u et al., 2021). This is where the hotel industry plays a role in helping to achieve these goals.

Among one of the most important sectors of the tourism and hospitality business in Nigeria, the hotel industry is partially responsible for protecting and maintaining the aesthetic quality of the country’s environment (Idoko & Kasim, 2019). Understandably, the greater the aesthetic quality of a country’s environment, the more likely it is to attract tourists. As a result, hotels must work hard to achieve reciprocal advantages between the hotel and the natural environment to ensure that their operations do not harm biodiversity and resources such as land, air, water, and energy. Amidst rising population numbers and urban congestion, sustainable development practices prove a challenge between meeting environmental goals and the demand for massive infrastructure projects. Nonetheless, it is critical to recognise the importance of sustainable development practices on the diversity of all life forms. After all, healthy biodiversity is integral to the ecosystem that humans rely on for food, housing, medicine, and clothing, among other things.

Environmentally responsible practices have piqued the interest of practitioners and academics around the world. Yet, the method in which it is carried out by Nigerian transnational hotels has garnered little to no attention in academic publications (Idoko & Kasim, 2019). This lack of attention is in part caused by Nigerian transnational hotels, who despite using ecologically friendly procedures, do not practise these procedures on a widespread level. As such, the existing scholars has acknowledged that Nigerian hotels lack internal environmental management standards despite engaging in certain ecologically beneficial programmes (Idoko & Kasim, 2019). Secondly, because GHRM is a relatively new practice in many countries, the literature assessment has identified that few articles examine the effect of GHRM on corporate sustainability.

Notably, there is also a dearth of real-world examples and empirical evidence demonstrating the efficacy of GHRM in promoting business sustainability in the Nigerian hotel environment. With these issues in mind, this study attempts to close the gap between GHRM and corporate sustainability, while locating the research within a Nigerian context. As such, this study departs from past research by conducting an empirical examination of the relationship between GHRM and organisational sustainability in Nigerian hotels. At present, low retention rates are among the biggest issues faced by governments in developing countries like Malaysia, South Korea, Singapore, and Taiwan (Wijesiri et al., 2018). When an employee leaves their job, not only does the company lose a staff but also loyal clients of the employee, business expertise, existing projects, rivals, and a piece of the company’s history (Naseem et al., 2011). Sinniah and Kamil (2017) have noted that money is not always the source or root cause of staff turnover. In fact, most contributors to staff turnover can be traced directly to management procedures. For instance, researchers believe that a manager’s leadership style and approach to people management has a direct impact on the organisation's ability to retain or lose its workforce (Bodjrenou et al., 2016). Similarly, Sinniah and Kamil (2017) assert that the way human resources are managed in an organisation creates the terms and conditions of the employee-employer relationship.

Although much research has attempted to suggest methods to alleviate high turnover rates, recent statistics have demonstrated that the overall turnover rate in hotels continues to increase at an alarming speed (Nyamekye, 2012). For example, the United States reports the annual turnover rate of hotel and motel workers to measure at 73.8% (Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2018). In China, data collected by the Human Resources Growth and Training Centre...
Tourism Association indicates that the total turnover rate of Chinese hotel employees in 2016 was as high as 3.34% per month (Yao et al., 2019). Likewise, in 2016, Nigeria’s National Bureau of Statistics (NBS) identified the country’s hospitality industry’s turnover rate to have exceeded 70%, while the average turnover rate of other private-sector jobs was only measured to be 46%. As such, empirical research conducted by Ohunakin et al. (2016) and Akwara et al. (2014) has established that employee turnover and real turnover have become the foremost problems for the economy, researchers, and practitioners in the hospitality sector.

The turnover crisis is a critical issue that needs to be addressed because it threatens the continued profitability of the hotel industry (Wijesiri et al., 2018; Bello et al. 2021). Williams et al. (2015) and Nwabuzor (2018) assert that high employee turnover in the hotel industry reduces efficiency, tarnishes the image and reputation of the company, and increases the cost of rehiring new employees. Guma (2011) also states that poor employee retention contributes to many other related costs, including the additional burden created on remaining employees, recruitment and training costs, productivity loss, customer loss, and intellectual capital loss. To alleviate these problems, Yong et al.’s (2018) findings argue that Green Human Resource Management (GHRM) is capable of strengthening the organisational commitment of staff, encourage eco-friendly practices, and boost the environmental performance of hotels. Thus, human resource managers ought to develop GHRM policies for hotels. This belief is supported by Daifallah and Awwad (2017) who have also offered GHRM as a solution to reduce the rate of employee turnover through positive human resource practices such as good pay, job autonomy, and job security.

Green management and GHRM practices have been the focus of several studies in the past (Ahmad, 2015; Masri & Jaaron, 2017; Rawashdeh, 2018). These studies emphasised the use of GHRM practices such as green recruitment and selection, green training and development, green performance management, green reward system, and green cordial relations to enhance positive staff commitment and eco-friendly performance. However, no study has been able to identify the Relative Importance Index (RII) of the GHRM strategies commonly researched by scholars within the hotel sector. This study contributes to our understanding of the relationship between GHRM practices and employee retention in the hotel industry, and its findings have implications for both theory and practice. Furthermore, this paper satisfies the two criteria for theory contribution: novelty and utility. This study is unique because it includes empirical evidence of GHRM’s RII on employee retention. Such an analysis may be extremely useful for solving organisational problems related to staff turnover.

**Literature review**

**The concept of retention**

Retention is described as a commitment to remain in an exchange or business with a specific company (Ohunakin et al., 2016; Nyamekye, 2012). It should be the intentional purpose of an establishment to create an opportunity that involves retaining workforces over a long period (Nyamekye, 2012). Norah (2016) opines that retention is motivated by numerous features that must be managed effectively. These features include work benefits, salary, career growth and the organisation itself. Ann (2017) agree that the main goal of retention is to avoid the forfeiture of skilled employees as this could potentially harm the productivity and profitability of the company.

**Factors influencing retention**
Past scholarship has attempted to investigate the methods that upper-level managers utilise to retain employees. Organisational leaders seem to be increasingly aware that the replacement of an employee is often more expensive than retaining the employee (Zahoor & Ijaz, 2015). Thus, it is common to use a variety of methods that align with maintaining an active workforce, while still meeting operational needs. Notably, stress at work can enhance interpersonal difficulties and increase the likelihood of employees taking leaves or being absent from work (Ann, 2017). As such, scholars like Ann (2017) and Yang (2010) believe that managers have found it helpful to resort to monitoring hotel workers closely as a way to minimise all signs of discontent and stress. Additionally, Das and Baruah (2013) has identified seven factors that might influence employee retention: salary and appreciation for the work done, provision for challenging work, chances for learning and promotion, good working conditions, good relations between colleagues, a healthy work-life balance, and good communication within the organisation.

**GHRM practices in organisations**

The GHRM philosophy was established in the 1990s and became universally accepted in the 2000s. According to Jabbar (2015), GHRM is the inference of Human Resource Management (HRM) procedures. GHRM relates to the eco-friendly management dimension of HRM (Renwick et al., 2013), and can be described as positive environmental results for HRM purposes (Kramar, 2014). In the hotel industry, green practices are helpful to improve the hotel’s image, encourage self-confidence among workers, increase productivity, reduce costs, minimise waste, and save time (Alhadid & Abu-Rumma, 2014). Therefore, GHRM might be a more suitable framework for implementation as GHRM practices have both organisational and environmental impacts (Renwick et al., 2013). Furthermore, various studies have found that the application of GHRM practices correlates with the effective enactment of green procedures. Renwick (2013) has outlined the most effective GHRM practices to commit employees to an organisation. These practices are discussed in the following subsections.

**Green recruitment and selection (GRS)**

The green recruitment process involves the appointment of green-conscious applicants without the use of papers. Instead, web-based applications are received via email, and interviews are conducted through telephone calls or video meetings (Harvey et al. & Jabbar et al., 2015). Although recruitment and selection seem synonymous, Gopinath & Shibu (2014) clarifies that recruitment specifically refers to the method of discovering and inviting potential candidates (within and outside of the establishment) into an evaluation for job considerations. On the other hand, selection is a streamlining process in which organisations decide which suitable candidate will join the organisation, and which will not. It has been argued that for organisations to establish and sustain competitive advantage, it is essential to select the right candidate.

**Green training and development (GTD)**

GTD includes work practices for employees to enhance waste reduction, resource efficiency, energy conservation, and alleviate environmental degradation caused by hotel operations (Ullah, 2017). GTD helps teach employees about green initiatives and skills concerning eco-friendly issues (Liebowitz, 2010). This programme might also be effective in instilling a sense of interest in environmental problem-solving skills amongst employees (Zoogah, 2011). Scholars believe that the flow of knowledge regarding green policies can substantially impact environmental-related performance in hotels (Longoni et al., 2014; Vidal-Salazar et al. 2012), and create a sense of environmental consciousness (Deepika & Karpagam, 2016). Therefore,
it is possible for companies that invest in training and development for their employees to expect profit and yield for their venture (Moaz, 2017).

**Green performance and appraisal (GPA)**

GPA is concerned with assessing workers' performance within the operating system of an organisation (Jabbour et al., 2008 & Guiyao et al., 2017). Aspects of GPA might include providing feedback and balancing measurements (Zibbaras & Coan, 2015), however, research has suggested that these techniques lack effectiveness (Guiyao et al., 2017). For better efficiency, firms ought to grant higher regard for the organisation’s goals when determining a technique to implement green performance (GP). Adopting and implementing a GP standard is necessary to guarantee the performance of employees in accomplishing organisational goals (Odeyale, 2014). In addition, employees must be tested for their success per the hotel's green goals. Here, green performance indicators must involve establishing a collection of green measures in performance reviews for stakeholders.

**Green pay and reward (GPR)**

GPR refers to processes that appreciate the efforts and performance of employees (Ahmad, 2015). Jabbour et al. (2013) describe GPR as a combination of monetary and non-monetary incentives designed to attract and motivate workers to contribute to hotel goals. Green Pay and rewards commonly involve salary, wages, or other incentives that can be used in support to improve the environmental initiatives of a business entity. Rewards are powerful and significant tools to affect an individual's interests and behaviour. A green reward scheme should be used in hotels to inspire all levels of staff into retention (Jabbour et al., 2013). Staff can be given money or other forms of incentives such as accolades, awards, and praises to ensure the attention and dedication of employees to their duties (Jabbour et al., 2008). Furthermore, there is reason to believe that rewards are helpful to contribute to the fulfilment of eco-initiatives (Renwick et al., 2013).

**Employee green relations (EGR)**

EGR is the practice that regulates and controls the behaviours of supervisors towards employees and promotes a healthy and harmonious employee-employer relationship. Employees should be included in environmental management practices that encourage them to support pollution reduction and identify opportunities to participate in environmentally friendly actions (Renwick et al., 2013). Engaging in EGR could involve planning orientation programmes that help to integrate new employees into a culture of green consciousness (Ullah, 2017). Deepika and Karpagam (2016) emphasise that employees’ contributions towards green initiatives will likely increase the effectiveness of green management practices. Therefore, organisations should deem it important to cultivate an environment that encourages employees to support green initiatives through intentional actions and decisions.

**Green Health & Safety (GHS)**

GHS policies are systems concerned with the proper management of the environment through efforts that seek to protect employees and involved persons from having their health and safety threatened by an organisation's operations, products, and services (Iheanacho & Ebitu, 2016). Here, management staff must become advocates for safety plans, and employees should be allowed to offer suggestions to help improve workplace safety (Reber et al., 1990). When their welfare is deemed important to the organisation, employees are more likely to find fulfilment in their job and exercise great performance (Logasakthi & Rajagopal, 2013). Salman et al.
(2016) has reported that governments, too, have acknowledged the importance of health and safety practices in reducing turnover rates, and increasing retention.

**Theory building**

This study adopts the use of organisational support theory (OST), which was first proposed by Eisenberger et al. in a 1986 study. The theory posits that employees' affective commitment to organisations can motivate them to contribute positively to the company, and help to achieve goals. OST also suggests that if managers demonstrate appreciation for employee engagement, employees are more likely to remain committed (Eisenberger et al. 1986). OST is broadly categorised into three types of variables: fairness, rewards and conducive work conditions, and supervisor support. Fairness refers to the existence of fair practices during recruitment and selection, performance appraisal, and the creation of opportunities to voice concerns. Rewards and conducive conditions refer to a safe and healthy working environment, job autonomy, opportunities for growth and promotion, and pay and incentives. Finally, supervisor support refers to the degree to which employees believe they are cared for by upper-level management. In this study, all of the aforementioned variables are used. It is believed that employees are more likely to willingly engage in green initiatives if they perceive support and benefits to arise from engaging in green practices (Paillé & Nhat et al., 2019).

**Methodology**

The researchers collected data from low-level hotel employees with at least one year of working experience in a green practising hotel in Nigeria. Seven hotels were adopted in this study: Four Point by Sheraton Hotel, Blu Radisson Hotel, Protea Hotel, Eko Hotels & Suites, Sheraton Hotel, Hilton Transcorp, and Envoy Hotel. The former five hotels are confirmed to have a vast knowledge of environmental practices in Lagos, while the latter two (Hilton Transcorp and Envoy Hotel) are confirmed to be eco-friendly by Abuja’s Ministry of Tourism, Arts and Culture. Prior to the study, top management officials or the directors of human resource departments within the hotels were contacted to gain permission. Purposive sampling was adopted due to the peculiarity of the study. Additionally, the researchers designed the questionnaire and adopted self-administration. The survey was created using criteria derived from a literature study and consultation with an expert. In total, the following procedures were involved: identifying the survey's objectives, defining the sampling group, developing the questionnaire, administering the questionnaire, and evaluating the results. A total of 460 questionnaires were distributed between May 2020 and March 2021. Hotel employees (operational level staff) were invited to voluntarily participate in the survey via a public notice released from the human resource units of respective hotels. Participants then responded to the questions using a self-administration technique. Unfortunately, due to Covid-19 and Nigeria’s lockdown measures, the survey was delayed and it took longer than expected for the questionnaires to be returned. Eventually, a total of 430 questionnaires were returned from the seven hotels. The self-administered questionnaire consisted of seven sections.

**Measurement**

This study considered the following 37 items, listed in order: 5 items for GRS; 7 items for GTD; 6 items for GPA; 4 items for EGR; 7 items for GPR; 8 items for GHS. As Nigeria is an English-speaking country, the authors wrote the questionnaire in English. A Likert scale ranging from “strongly disagree (1)” to “strongly agree (5)” was used to measure each item of the GRS, GTD, GPA, EGR, GPR, and GHS variables. The reported Cronbach’s alpha values
for all dimensions were more than 0.8 (Nejati et al., 2017; Saeed et al., 2019; Pham et al., 2019; Agbola, 2012).

**Validation and reliability of research instrument scale**

In terms of the validity of the content, the results of the questionnaires were evaluated in accordance with the objectives of the study. An analysis using construct validity and reliability coefficient (Cronbach’s alpha) was used as these measures will remain useful in any further analyses of the objectives and hypotheses of the study. Cronbach’s alpha measured each variable’s absolute correlation to be smaller than the squared root of the average variance, indicating appropriate discriminant validity among these constructs.

According to Kline (2011), Cronbach’s alpha is used to check the internal consistency of the products for a specific construct. All the variables have indicated Cronbach’s alpha values above 0.80, which has exceeded the threshold criterion suggested by Nannally (1978), Nunnally and Bernstein (1994). All variables returned Cronbach’s alpha values ranging from 0.856 to 0.930 (Table 1).

**Table 1: Scale statistics**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Cronbach’s Alpha</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GR5</td>
<td>4.54</td>
<td>0.646</td>
<td>0.630</td>
<td>430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GR6</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>0.629</td>
<td>0.630</td>
<td>430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GR3</td>
<td>4.55</td>
<td>0.630</td>
<td>0.630</td>
<td>430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GR4</td>
<td>4.39</td>
<td>0.654</td>
<td>0.654</td>
<td>430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GTD1</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>0.638</td>
<td>0.638</td>
<td>430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GTD2</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>0.683</td>
<td>0.683</td>
<td>430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GTD3</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>0.638</td>
<td>0.638</td>
<td>430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GTD4</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>0.691</td>
<td>0.691</td>
<td>430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GTD5</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>0.746</td>
<td>0.746</td>
<td>430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GTD6</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>0.678</td>
<td>0.678</td>
<td>430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GTD7</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>0.751</td>
<td>0.751</td>
<td>430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPA1</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>0.732</td>
<td>0.732</td>
<td>430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPA2</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>0.664</td>
<td>0.664</td>
<td>430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPA3</td>
<td>4.55</td>
<td>0.709</td>
<td>0.709</td>
<td>430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPA4</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>0.682</td>
<td>0.682</td>
<td>430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPA5</td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>0.671</td>
<td>0.671</td>
<td>430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPA6</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>0.833</td>
<td>0.833</td>
<td>430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPR1</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>0.668</td>
<td>0.668</td>
<td>430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPR2</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>0.735</td>
<td>0.735</td>
<td>430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPR3</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>0.685</td>
<td>0.685</td>
<td>430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPR4</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>0.906</td>
<td>0.906</td>
<td>430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPR5</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>0.724</td>
<td>0.724</td>
<td>430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPR6</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>0.664</td>
<td>0.664</td>
<td>430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPR7</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>0.908</td>
<td>0.908</td>
<td>430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPR8</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>0.661</td>
<td>0.661</td>
<td>430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPR9</td>
<td>4.45</td>
<td>0.845</td>
<td>0.845</td>
<td>430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPR10</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>0.853</td>
<td>0.853</td>
<td>430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPR11</td>
<td>4.49</td>
<td>0.636</td>
<td>0.636</td>
<td>430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GHS1</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>0.794</td>
<td>0.794</td>
<td>430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GHS2</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>0.986</td>
<td>0.986</td>
<td>430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GHS3</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>0.708</td>
<td>0.708</td>
<td>430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GHS4</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>0.731</td>
<td>0.731</td>
<td>430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GHS5</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>0.731</td>
<td>0.731</td>
<td>430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GHS6</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>0.765</td>
<td>0.765</td>
<td>430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GHS7</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>0.749</td>
<td>0.749</td>
<td>430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GHS8</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>0.768</td>
<td>0.768</td>
<td>430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ER1</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>0.746</td>
<td>0.746</td>
<td>430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ER2</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>0.619</td>
<td>0.619</td>
<td>430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ER3</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>0.647</td>
<td>0.647</td>
<td>430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ER4</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>0.799</td>
<td>0.799</td>
<td>430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ER5</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>0.769</td>
<td>0.769</td>
<td>430</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Furthermore, each variable’s absolute correlation is smaller than the squared root of the average variance, indicating appropriate discriminant validity among these constructs (Kline, 2011). This criterion helps to avoid ambiguous statements in the research tool that could potentially affect respondents’ understanding of the questionnaire.
Data analysis

Respondent profile

Table 2 presents the profiles of the respondents. The questionnaire was administered to junior-level, operational staff. Of the 430 responses returned, 282 of the participants were male (65.6%), and 148 were female (34.4%). 9 of the respondents fell into the 18-20 age range (2.1%), 109 were in the 21-30 age range (25.3%), 202 were in the 31-40 age range (47%), 82 were in the 41-50 age range (19.1%), and 28 were above 51 years old (6.5%). In terms of marital status, 127 of the respondents were single (29.5%), 259 were married (60.2%), 31 were divorced (7.2%), and 13 fell into the ‘Others’ category (3.0%). The results also conveyed the academic qualifications of the hotel staff: 24 were at the Senior School Certificate Examination (SSCE) level (5.6%), 184 have National Diploma (ND) and Nigeria Certificate in Education (NCE) qualifications (42.8%), 160 have Higher National Diploma (HND) and Bachelor of Science (BSc) qualifications (37.2%), and 62 have Master of Science (MSc) degrees (14.4%).

Table 2: Demographic profile

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic profile</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type of respondents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operational level staff</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>65.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>34.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-20 years</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-30 years</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>25.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-40 years</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>47.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-50 years</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>19.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51 years &amp; above</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>29.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>60.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSCE</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ND/NCE</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>42.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HND/BSc</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>37.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSc</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>14.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 1 year</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2 years</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>49.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-4 years</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>25.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-6 years</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>11.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 years &amp; above</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>12.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#10,000 - #30,000</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#31,000 - #50,000</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>34.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#51,000 - #70,000</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>15.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#71,000 - #90,000</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>15.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#91,000 - #110,000</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#111,000 - #130,000</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#131,000 - #150,000</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The RII technique

The RII technique is used to assess the relative importance of various delays’ causes and effects. In this investigation, the same procedure was used across the different variables. Each variable’s RII was calculated using a five-point scale ranging from 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 5 (Strongly Agree) (Akadiri, 2011). The responses from the respondents were analysed using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) version 25 software. The study was divided into two categories based on the content of the questionnaire: demographic and RII. RII was
used to rank criteria according to their relative importance. The relative index was calculated using the formula below:

$$RII = \sum_{A} \frac{W}{A \times N}$$

W denotes the weightage given by each respondent to each variable in the questionnaire. Variables were ranked using a scale of 1 to 5, with one denoting the lowest and five denoting the greatest. The highest weight is A, and the total number of people in the sample is N. The weighted average for the two groups was established based on the ranking © of the RII. RII values can be translated into five different levels:

Table 3. Relative importance index results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Strongly Agree(1)</th>
<th>Agree (2)</th>
<th>Undecided (3)</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree(5)</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>TotalN</th>
<th>A*N</th>
<th>RII</th>
<th>Ave. RII</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GRS5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>504</td>
<td>1340</td>
<td>1952</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>2150</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRS2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>612</td>
<td>1235</td>
<td>1935</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>2150</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRS1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>516</td>
<td>1345</td>
<td>1957</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>2150</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRS4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>1370</td>
<td>1887</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>2150</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRS5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>504</td>
<td>1350</td>
<td>1956</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>2150</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GGT2</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>768</td>
<td>1485</td>
<td>1669</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>2150</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GGT3</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>1092</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>1590</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>2150</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GGT4</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>396</td>
<td>828</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>1505</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>2150</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GGT5</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>756</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>1443</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>2150</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GGT6</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>358</td>
<td>712</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>1522</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>2150</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GGT7</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>1084</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>1599</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>2150</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GGT8</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>399</td>
<td>936</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>1529</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>2150</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPA1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>652</td>
<td>1055</td>
<td>1870</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>2150</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPA2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>712</td>
<td>1065</td>
<td>1899</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>2150</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPA3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>748</td>
<td>1348</td>
<td>1869</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>2150</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPA4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>812</td>
<td>1385</td>
<td>1834</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>2150</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPA5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>772</td>
<td>1355</td>
<td>1857</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>2150</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPA6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>636</td>
<td>1338</td>
<td>1830</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>2150</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPA7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>414</td>
<td>912</td>
<td>1315</td>
<td>1643</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>2150</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPA8</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>361</td>
<td>712</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>1556</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>2150</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPA9</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>732</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>1559</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>2150</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPA10</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>336</td>
<td>556</td>
<td>805</td>
<td>1733</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>2150</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPR1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>938</td>
<td>1640</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>2150</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPR2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>361</td>
<td>773</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>1559</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>2150</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPR3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>414</td>
<td>676</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>2150</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPR4</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>660</td>
<td>1135</td>
<td>1917</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>2150</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPR5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>492</td>
<td>1345</td>
<td>1951</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>2150</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPR6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>620</td>
<td>1210</td>
<td>1929</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>2150</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPR7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>860</td>
<td>1768</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>2150</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPR8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>740</td>
<td>1782</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>2150</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPR9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>760</td>
<td>1766</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>2150</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPR10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>780</td>
<td>1776</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>2150</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPR11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>810</td>
<td>1760</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>2150</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPR12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>660</td>
<td>1760</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>2150</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

High (0.8 < RII < 1), high medium (0.6 < RII < 0.8), medium (0.4 < RII < 0.6), medium-low (M-L) (0.2 < RII < 0.4), and low (L) (0 < RII < 0.2) (Akandri, 2011).

Table 3 shows the RII values, Average Relevant Important Index (ARII), and ranks for the GHRM components on retention in the hotel industry. As demonstrated in the table, the results revealed that GRS has the highest-ranked ARII value at 0.901. EGR ranked second highest at 0.897, followed by GPA at 0.868, GHS at 0.820, GPR at 0.741, and GTD at 0.722. Thus, the results suggest that GRS has the highest retention value in the hotel industry other than GHRM practices.

Relative Important Index formula

$$= 5n_5 + 4n_4 + 3n_3 + 2n_2 + n_1$$
Discriminant validity

Table 4 shows the results of the discriminant validity test. The correlations between the different variables in the model do not exceed 0.85, as Kline (2011) recommends. Each variable's absolute correlation is smaller than the squared root of the average variance, indicating appropriate discriminant validity among these constructs (Kline, 2011).

Table 4: Discriminant validity results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Green_Perf</th>
<th>Green_Tra</th>
<th>Green_Rec</th>
<th>Green_Pay</th>
<th>Green_Health</th>
<th>Emp_Green</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Green_Perf_ap</td>
<td>0.784</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green_Tra_dev</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.812</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green_Rec_sel</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.786</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green_Pay_rew</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>0.791</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green_Health</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.863</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emp_Green_rel</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.781</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Confirmatory factor analysis (CFA)

Using SPSS Amos 24, this study used Structural Equation Modelling (SEM) to conduct a CFA to measure the goodness of fit and investigate path analysis. As stated previously, the variables used to examine green retention strategies have already been validated by other researchers. Therefore, on our part, we conducted a CFA to determine the validity of the factor structure of employee retention procedures. Comparative fit index (CFI) and Tucker–Lewis index (TLI) values that are normally acceptable are around 0.95, while Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA) should be less than 0.08. (Hair et al., 2010). Our study was found to meet the proposed measurement model of a chi-square of 2675.369, df = 798, TLI = 0.88, CFI = 0.89, GFI = 0.93, RMSEA = 0.073.

Structural model

We have further tested the structural model for goodness of fit. The structural model produced a comparatively lower fit with a chi-square of 2762.913, df = 813, CFI = 0.801, TLI = 0.75, RMSEA = 0.086. However, the fit statistics are still acceptable (Kline, 2011).
Table 5 demonstrates the results of our path analysis. The results reveal a significant positive influence of all independent variables on employee retention except Green Pay and Reward which is statistically positive but not significant.

Table 5. Path analysis results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Estimate</th>
<th>S.E.</th>
<th>C.R.</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employee Retention &lt;= Green_Perf_ap</td>
<td>0.212</td>
<td>0.059</td>
<td>3.566</td>
<td>&lt; 0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Retention &lt;= Green_Tra_dev</td>
<td>0.330</td>
<td>0.064</td>
<td>5.110</td>
<td>&lt; 0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Retention &lt;= Green_Rec_sel</td>
<td>0.121</td>
<td>0.060</td>
<td>1.999</td>
<td>0.046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Retention &lt;= Green_Pay_rew</td>
<td>0.095</td>
<td>0.055</td>
<td>1.730</td>
<td>0.084</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Retention &lt;= Green_Health</td>
<td>0.309</td>
<td>0.050</td>
<td>6.182</td>
<td>&lt; 0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Retention &lt;= Emp_Green_rel</td>
<td>0.147</td>
<td>0.063</td>
<td>2.344</td>
<td>0.019</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discussion

The data analysis in this study reveals that a high proportion of respondent’s regard GRS as the most important factor impacting their retention (RII value of 0.901; Beta = 0.121, P < 0.05). This result suggests that hotel managers should develop strong recruitment strategies to hire people who have knowledge, skills, methods, and behaviours that align with the environmental management systems inside of the organisation. When employees align with practices and procedures inside of the hotel, employees are more likely to remain engaged in their work, and managers will in turn be able to retain their personnel for a longer amount of time. Consistent with this result, Mwita, and Kinemo, (2018) argue that GRS is also capable of influencing employees’ perceptions of organisational attractiveness. The researchers also suggest that pro-environmental attitude, socio-environmental consciousness, environmental-related standard registration, a desire to have a big impact through one’s work, and job seeker’s expertise are moderators of that influence. Despite this, in Malaysia, Islam et al. (2020) investigated the impact of GRS, green involvement, and green rewards on millennial employees' willingness to leave the hotel industry. The partial least squares SEM (PLS-SEM) analysis revealed that GRS had no significant impact on employee turnover intention in the Malaysian hotel industry.

Interestingly, the results of path analysis demonstrate that GTD has the strongest influence on green employee retention (Beta = 0.330, P < 0.05). GTD has an RII value of 0.772. Based on these results, it is possible to assume that training development is also a significant influencing factor for employee retention (Khazaei, 2019). GTD for employees is usually centred on waste reduction, resource efficiency, energy conservation, and a better understanding of the reasons for hotel environmental degradation (Ullah, 2017). GTD aids management in ensuring that employees are engaged in learning how to solve environmental problems (Zoogah, 2011). This outcome, therefore, signifies the process of providing employees with working methods to ensure proper resource use, waste reduction, energy conservation, and reduced environmental degradation. When GTD is in place, public awareness of sustainable behaviours might be enhanced, and employee loyalty to the organisation could likely increase. The second most important influence factor on retention as reported by respondents is EGR (Average RII of 0.897; Beta = 0.147, P < 0.05). Unfortunately, very few studies have investigated the role of EGR on employee retention among Nigerian hotel workers. The data also demonstrates that GPA measures an average RII of 0.868; Beta = 0.212, P < 0.05. According to the researchers’ findings, GPA has a positive influence on employees' pro-environmental behaviour. On the contrary, a PLS-SEM investigation conducted by Al Kerdawy, (2019) found that hotel staff in Malaysia do not regard GPA to have a meaningful association with environmental performance. Such inconsistency in findings suggests a need to conduct further investigations on GPA in different countries.
GHS ranked next with an average RII of 0.820; Beta = 0.309, P < 0.05. The GHS construct is similar to traditional health and safety administration, and several other commonly practised aspects of environmental management. These practices usually include environmental protection and community livelihood programmes. The central function of GHS management is to provide a green workplace for all employees (Shah, 2019).

Therefore, continually devoting money to various environmental programmes will reduce worker stress and job-related illnesses caused by hazardous work environments. Hotel businesses should create measures to preserve a healthy workplace and avoid health problems. Additionally, environmental management and the costs associated with it is helpful to promote employee health and the health of local communities. As a result, hotels’ reputations will grow as they become known to be good employers, and employees become recognised as socially and environmentally responsible citizens. This study's findings show that GHRM strategies have an impact on employee retention, and an employee’s motivation to participate in an organisation's environmental performance. Furthermore, hotels can play a critical role in addressing environmental concerns through the use of GHRM practices. The elements that motivate employees to engage in GHRM practices were investigated in this study. Respondents (employees) from companies that use GHRM practices were surveyed. Data was collected via convenient sampling.

Conclusion
Green practices and conservation have become a key theme for future management studies to help organisations meet their goals. This paper discussed extensively the issues causing high turnover rates, and how to enhance employee retention in hotels. Based on the information gathered, the most effective GHRM practices were identified using SEM and RII, and it was found that the ranking of GRS, EGR, GPA, and GHS suggests higher effectiveness of these practices in comparison to other GHRM programmes. The effective enactment of green procedures can potentially inspire employees into involving themselves in organisation activities, which will resultantly improve organisational performance and enhance retention. Green initiatives are also necessary and important for practitioners, scholars, and policymakers in countries.

The hotel industry is a challenging environment that has the potential to grow into a successful and sustainable industry if they adopt GHRM practices. Even so, our study reveals that within a Nigerian context, GRS may be more effective to retain employees than other GHRM strategies adopted in this study. Therefore, efforts should be directed to ensure that hotels properly enact GRS. Furthermore, there are limitations in the current study which may serve as a means to innovate future research. Impending studies should consider the experimental research of this study. Specifically, this study utilised a positivist approach to gather and analyse data. Future studies might adopt an interpretivist approach to gain a detailed look at employees’ perceptions of GHRM practices in the hotel industry. Wider research on the effects of GHRM practices in hotels and other industries should also be considered. In addition, more empirical research must be conducted on other industries.

Theoretical implications
This study hopes to expand the theoretical study of employee retention within the context of hotels. At present, there is limited research investigating GHRM practices on retention in hotels. Thus, this study aims to contribute to the current knowledge base for HRM. This investigation also utilised a combined SEM-RII method to develop a more novel and robust analytical framework in the field of GHRM practices. Furthermore, through the use of OST, this investigation anticipates that the implementation of appropriate GHRM practices can
influence employee retention because it is proven that HRM practices are important to ensure employees’ happiness, motivation, and want to stay in organisations (Dierendonck et al., 2016). Although many studies have explored OST, few have attempted to connect OST to GHRM practices in the hotel industry in Nigeria. Therefore, this study is the first of its kind to offer researchers and practitioners a Nigerian understanding, as well as a combined perspective of OST and GHRM literature, along with its implications for the hotel industry. Future research may view this study as a launching pad for new developments of OST. This analysis is also a valuable resource for researchers who are interested in both the fields of green practices and HRM.

**Practical implications**

This present study is among the first empirical studies conducted on GHRM practices in the hotel industry in Nigeria. Our analysis proves that GHRM can impact the pride of hotel workers, and encourage them to do their best in their workplace with little to no supervision. This study also reveals GRS to be especially effective for retention through the use of RII—an effort that has not been reported by any scholar. As such, the recommendations of this analysis should persuade hotels to adopt GHRM practices. As stated before, the implementation of GHRM is known to offer widespread benefits, which may include lowered costs, improved reputation, increased productivity, and reduced waste (Kasim, 2007).
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